



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,201	03/09/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS990858US1	4117

24033 7590 09/29/2005

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/522,201

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 07/19/2005 to the original application filed 03/2000.
2. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Duperrouzel et al.** (U.S. 6,832,355 – filed 07/1998).

As to independent claim 1:

- a. Duperrouzel teaches (*see the Abstract*) a method for displaying pages (*displays web pages*) in a viewer program (*a browser software program*) on a computer display monitor (*a display system*), wherein the viewer program displays an application window (*display areas*), comprising:

Art Unit: 2176

- (i) downloading a first and second pages (*receives web pages*) from one of multiple servers (*from web sites*) over a network (*via the network*) (*col.2, lines 1-17 and col.4, lines 20-28*);
 - (ii) automatically concurrently displaying (*multiple web pages to be simultaneously displayed; col.4, lines 44-57*) the first page in a first window pane (*display pane 212a; col.5, lines 1-7 and Fig.2*) and the second page in a second window pane (*display pane 212b; col.5, lines 1-7 and Fig.2*) in the application window according to predefined settings specifying how pages are to be displayed in the first and second panes (*display panes 212a, 212b ... is a display area that frames and provides controls for a particular web page being displayed within the display pane 212; col.5, lines 1-7*);
 - (iii) downloading a third page from one of multiple servers over the network (*receives web pages via the network from web page sites; col.2, lines 1-17/ web pages that have been download from multiple web page sites; col.4, lines 44-57*); and
 - (iv) downloading a fourth page from one of multiple servers over the network (*receives web pages via the network from web page sites; col.2, lines 1-17/ web pages that have been download from multiple web page sites; col.4, lines 44-57*).
- b. Duperrouzel does teach automatically concurrently displaying the third and fourth pages according to the predefined settings (*four non-overlapping web pages are*

simultaneously displayed; col.4, lines 58-67). Duperrouzel, however, does not specifically teach “displaying the third page in one of the first and second panes and displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and second panes.”

- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have applied Duperrouzel’s teachings to include *“displaying the third page in one of the first and second panes and displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and second panes”* because it would helped the user to keep a general perspective in mind while examining more detail in additional one or more displayed web pages, and it would also have allowed the user to speed up searches.
- d. The fact that Duperrouzel’s teachings *“A two web page display 610 has only two display panes 212a and 212b” (col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6)* and *“has only two display panes”* in Duperrouzel suggests that when the third and fourth web page are downloaded, they will be simultaneously displayed in the first and second panes.

As to dependent claim 2:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane (*Fig.5*), wherein automatically concurrently displaying the third page and one of the first and second pages comprises concurrently displaying the second page in the first pane and the third page in the second pane (*col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6*).

As to dependent claims 3:

Duperrouzel teaches caching previously downloaded pages in the order in which they were downloaded from the network (*col.9, lines 21-53*); and automatically concurrently displaying the previously displayed page in the first pane and the first page in the second pane (*col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6*) according to the predefined settings (*col.2, lines 3-17 and col.5, lines 1-7*) in response to the user input command to display the previously displayed page (*col.11, lines 25-37*).

As to dependent claim 4:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane (*Fig.5*)

As to dependent claim 5:

Refer to discussion of claim 3 above for rejection.

As to dependent claim 6:

Duperrouzel teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link within one of the displayed pages; accessing the page addressed by the hypertext link (*col.6, lines 19-22*); automatically concurrently displaying the page currently displayed in the second pane in the first pane and displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the second pane if the user selected the hypertext link from the second pane; and automatically concurrently displaying the page currently displayed in the first pane in the first pane and displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the second pane if the user selected the hypertext link from the first pane (*col.3, lines 30-44; col. 11, lines 9-37*).

As to dependent claim 7:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane (Fig.6).

As to dependent claim 8:

Duperrouzel teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link within one of the displayed pages in one of the panes; accessing the page addressed by the hypertext link; and automatically concurrently displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the pane opposite the pane displaying the page from which the hypertext link was selected the page from which the link was selected in its current pane (*col.3, lines 31-44 & col.6, lines 5-22*).

As to dependent claim 9:

Duperrouzel teaches the viewer program is capable of displaying the downloaded pages in the first and second panes according to the predefined settings (*col.5, lines 1-7 & col.7, lines 13-25 and Fig.5*), where the pages downloaded from over the network do not include any page commands to cause the display of pages in separate panes within the application window (*col.7, lines 15-25*).

As to independent claim 10:

It is directed to a system for implementing the method of claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 11-18:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-9 above, are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 19:

It is directed to an article of manufacture for implementing the method of claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 20-27:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-9 above, are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

Duperrouzel patent does not teach the use of predefined setting specifying how pages are to be displayed in the panes. (Remarks, page 11)

In response:

Duperrouzel's teachings "*display panes 212a, 212b ... is a display area that frames and provides controls for a particular web page being displayed within the display pane 212*" (col.5, lines 1-7) do read-on "predefined setting specifying how pages are to be displayed in the panes" as claimed by Applicant.

As to dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27, the arguments are not persuasive for reason as discussed above with regards to independent claims 1, 9, and 19.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Adams et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,734,380	issued: May 31, 1998
Kingsley et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,847,706	issued: Dec. 8, 1998
Brooks et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6, 008,809	issued: Dec. 28, 1999
Greer et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,009,429	issued: Dec. 28, 1999
Robertson et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895	issued: Nov. 28, 2002
Ferguson	U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019	issued: Jul. 27, 2004

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/27/2005